DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 420 HE 031 870

AUTHOR	Baez, Benjamin
TITLE	Negotiating and Resisting Racism: How Faculty of Color Construct Promotion and Tenure.
PUB DATE	1998-01-11
NOTE	43p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Asian Americans; Blacks; College Faculty; Cultural Differences; *Educational Environment; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Ethnic Discrimination; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; Institutional Environment; *Minority Group Teachers; Nontenured Faculty; Organizational Climate; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Bias; Racial Identification; *Tenure; Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS	African Americans; Latinos; *Symbolic Interactionism

ABSTRACT

This study uses symbolic interactionism as a framework for understanding race, and for understanding how faculty of color construct the promotion and tenure process. Interviews were conducted with 16 faculty members at a private research university in a small United States city. Interviewees included eight African American women, three African American men, two Asian American women, one Asian American man, and two Latino men; all were tenured or on tenure track. Faculty evaluations were based on teaching, service, and scholarly achievement, defined primarily through research and publication. During open-ended, semistructured interviews participants were asked to talk about their promotion and tenure experiences. Faculty members' perceptions of racism were then classified into two categories: individual or institutional. It was found that faculty members negotiated and resisted racism as best they could; responses ranged from "giving up," to fighting back, to picking and choosing battles, to playing the game, finding mentoring support, and most importantly to defining promotion and tenure criteria in ways that benefited their racial communities that is, through "race" research and minority-related community service. The paper concludes that creating a more supportive environment for faculty of color will require the construction of a common understanding of race in higher education. (Contains 78 references.) (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 420

Negotiating and Resisting Racism: How Faculty of Color Construct Promotion and Tenure

by

Benjamin Baez
Georgia State University
(404) 651-1191

January 11, 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE031870

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Benjamin Baez
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Abstract

Grounded in symbolic interactionism, this study shed light into how sixteen faculty of color constructed the symbols making up their environment as racism. The faculty members perceived two types of racism—individual and institutional—and the author explains how each type of racism was negotiated. Although the research literature usually treats racism as an intractable barrier, the faculty members experiences provided evidence that individuals can, and do, resist societal structures.

The faculty of color in this study believed that attaining promotion and tenure would mean overcoming racism. This should not surprise us. The literature has addressed the prevalence of racism in academia (See e.g., Aguirre & Martinez, 1993; Boice, 1993a; Chavez & Padilla, 1995; Escuerta & O'Brien, 1995; Harvey, 1987; Menges & Exum, 1983; Mindiola, 1995; Nakanishi, 1993; Olivas, 1988; Smith, 1992). This literature has contributed to our understanding of racism as a structural barrier, but it appears to treat this obstacle as intractable and rarely describes how faculty negotiate it. This study, informed by symbolic interactionism, recognizes the obdurate reality of racism in academia but describes how some faculty of color negotiated and resisted this barrier.

Racism should be defined as either individual or institutional because this distinction has bearing on how this problem is to be resolved. Individual racism is based on the belief that Whites are superior to other racial groups and decisions are made according to this belief (Helms, 1990; Ransford, 1994). Because this definition emphasizes personal prejudice, resolutions must necessarily focus on individuals. Institutional racism does not involve prejudicial attitudes at all; it involves policies that maintain the economic and social advantage of Whites over other racial groups, although these policies may appear neutral on the surface (Helms, 1990). In this sense, racism is "embedded in the system" (Ransford, 1994). This definition focuses our attention on institutions, which is much harder to do but more effective for combating racism.

It is important to note that the tenure process is stressful for all faculty members, and most faculty members would probably report hostility from colleagues and other negative experiences at their institutions (See e.g., Boice, 1992; Daly & Townsend, 1992; Johnsrud & Atwater, 1993; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Whitt, 1991). The faculty members in this study, however, characterized their experiences as marked by racism, a perception most Whites are not likely to share. The faculty members perceived other causes as well for their struggles (e.g., personal conflicts with other

colleagues, poor departmental resources, etc.), and the women's struggles were compounded by perceived sexism[1], but racism was the most important challenge for them.

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism informed this study. This social theory has three basic premises: we know things by their meanings; these meanings are constructed through social interaction; and, meanings change through interaction (Fine, 1993; see also Blumer, 1969). Symbolic interactionism views human activity as primarily symbolic, in that individuals must interpret the symbols (i.e., signs, language, gestures, or anything conveying meaning) making up their environment and develop meanings that will guide their actions (Woods, 1992). Social interaction is a system of definitions and interpretations that operates to both sustain and transform established patterns of joint conduct (Woods, 1992). Social conflict occurs when the self and the community disagree about the meaning of symbols and the definitions of situations (Deegan, 1987).

Symbolic interactionists have been criticized for believing that social institutions can be understood from the bottom up and for de-emphasizing societal structures in influencing behavior. But this is not a valid criticism. Symbolic interactionism explains how people are influenced by societal structures by viewing the individual as interacting with his or her environment as a "generalized other" (Fine, 1993; Woods, 1992). It is in the form of the "generalized other" that social processes influence behavior and how "society" exercises control over its members (Woods, 1992). Individuals interact with their environment and base their decisions on what they perceive are the consequences or benefits of a given response. The imperatives of the system, therefore, can be acted out directly in people's behavior. But people do not merely respond to imperatives; they

---

[1] A number of studies have dealt with the particularly difficult challenges faced by women of color (See e.g., Aguirre, Hernandez, & Martinez, 1994; Alperson, 1975; Bassett, 1992; Carter, Pearson, & Shavlik, 1988; Gregory, 1995; Matthews, 1992; McKay, 1983; Moses, 1989).

develop coping strategies for negotiating their existence. They express preferences and exercise choices even in circumstances in which their access to information is incomplete and in which constraints limit the kinds of activities they can undertake (Lal, 1995).

Symbolic interactionism is a useful framework for understanding race. Racial groups provide individuals—through language, socialization, and education—patterns of symbolic meanings that are transmitted into their subjective world of meanings that direct their efforts (Lal, 1995). Traditional theories of racial identity make it psychologically central to an individual's concept of the *self* (Cross, 1991; Helms, 1990), but symbolic interactionism views racial identity as voluntary, optional, and situational. As Lal (1995) explained, racial minorities will often choose to emphasize their racial identities to advance group interests (i.e., to compete more effectively or to justify entitlement to scarce resources). So, although celebration of racial or ethnic identity may be valued in and of itself, it is also a strategic device for facilitating full participation in the economic, political, and social life of this country.

It is necessary, however, to consider the context in which meanings are constructed. In the United States, race must be analyzed in the context of a historically validated relationship of White dominance and people of color subordination and the inequitable distribution of resources this implies (Lal, 1995). The importance of racism as structural barrier cannot be ignored. The definitions and actions of powerful others sometimes renders choices and preferences negligible (Lal, 1995). As Mac an Ghaill (1988) indicated, race, gender, and class maintain Whites' hegemony. Therefore, in order to change these power relations, any theory of social change must account for these forces. Symbolic interactionism, long criticized for being apolitical and for its micro-analytic foundation, must become a theory of social change that considers race as a significant structural

barrier that constrains certain people of color's choices and that forces them to negotiate social institutions in ways not required of Whites.

Methods

In this study, I sought to understand how faculty of color constructed the promotion and tenure process. I conducted interviews between September 1994 and October 1995 with 16 faculty of color at a private Carnegie Research II university in a small city. Faculty were evaluated on teaching, service, and scholarly achievement, which was defined primarily through research and publications. The faculty, staff, and students at Research University were predominantly White. Whites accounted for approximately 80% of full-time students and 87% of full-time faculty. Men made up 68% and women 32% of the 1995 faculty. Faculty of color made up 13% of the total faculty. Men of color made up 9% of the total faculty, 13% of the male faculty, and 70% of the total faculty of color population. Women of color made up 4% of the total faculty, 12% of the female faculty, and 30% of faculty of color[2].

Women of color, however, were over-represented in this study's sample (10-6). The reason for this was that the snowballing technique was used to identify most of the participants in this study, and the faculty members tended to refer me to women. The extent to which the faculty members were involved in institutional governance may have had something to do with this. The women in this study were more involved than the men in institutional activities (e.g., the Black and Latino faculty association), and because of this the women were easily identifiable to other faculty of color.

---

[2] All of these numbers include tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. The institution would not provide me with a breakdown of tenure-track faculty.

There were two selection criteria for this study: (1) the faculty members had to be tenured or on the tenure track; and (2) they had to be members of a traditionally underrepresented group. Of the faculty members in this study, four were full professors with tenure; four were associate professors with tenure; two were associate professors without tenure; and six were assistant professors without tenure. Of the eight faculty members with tenure, three indicated that they came to the university with tenure; thus, only five had actually experienced the university's tenure process. Since the focus of this study was on how the faculty members constructed the promotion and tenure process, it was not important where they attained tenure. Of the untenured faculty members, one was denied tenure and was appealing at the time of the interview, and another had resigned and was completing a terminal year. One faculty member was preparing for the tenure review; two had completed their third-year reviews, and the rest were preparing for their third-year reviews.

The racial and gender make-up of the sample was: eight African American women; three African American men; two Asian American women; one Asian American man; and two Latino men. I attempted, but was unable, to obtain interviews with Latina professors. There were few tenure-track Latinas at the institution (there were less than 10 Latina faculty members and most were not on the tenure-track). The faculty members referred me to two Latina professors who qualified for the study, but these professors could not be reached in time to complete the study. The lack of Latinas in this sample is a limitation of this study, although the small body of literature available in this area indicates that they have similar concerns (see Carter, Pearson, & Shavlik, 1987; Chavez & Padilla, 1995). There were no Native American faculty at the institution who qualified for this study (in fact, there was only one Native American faculty member in the entire institution).

This was a qualitative study informed by symbolic interactionism, and so the focus was on understanding how participants interpreted their situations and made meaning of them (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Seidman, 1991). To understand how faculty of color constructed promotion and tenure, I chose the research interview as the most appropriate research method. The interviews averaged one and a half hours. I used an open-ended, semi-structured format in which participants were asked to talk about their promotion and tenure experiences. As the study progressed, I asked the faculty members to respond to some of the emerging themes in the study. Although the purpose of the study was to explore how the faculty members perceived the promotion and tenure process, the faculty members found it difficult to separate promotion and tenure from their day-to-day experiences. Their quest for promotion and tenure characterized their experiences in academia.

The data were coded for themes. Coding is the "general term for conceptualizing data" (Strauss, 1987, p. 20). The process of coding involves raising questions and providing provisional answers, organizing the data into manageable units, looking for core concepts, labeling them, and attempting to understand the relationship among core concepts (Strauss, 1987). Codes were developed early, organized and grouped, and modified or rejected as the study progressed. Analysis was an on-going interpretive process (Strauss, 1987), and emerging themes were tested throughout the study by asking the participants to respond to what others had indicated as important issues. The themes discussed arose from careful coding and analysis of the interview transcripts, from the participants' responses to emerging issues, and from a review of the relevant literature.

The quotations were edited for clarity and to protect the identity of the faculty members. I did not verify the data because to do so would have breached the promise of confidentiality. Some of the identities, locations, and events were changed slightly in order to protect the anonymity of

the participants. The need to edit the data, and in some cases not report the data at all, presents one of the difficulties of doing this type of research. Since the number of faculty of color is so low, it is difficult to report the findings while also maintaining confidentiality. In this study, the faculty members were often the only faculty of color in their departments. For this reason, departmental affiliation or academic field was not reported, although this information might have provided insightful distinctions.

Constructing Racism

The primary objective of this paper is to shed light into how faculty of color might negotiate racism, but in order to do so it is important to understand how they constructed this challenge. This section briefly describes how the faculty members interpreted the symbols in their environment as racism. I classified the faculty members' perceptions of racism into two categories: individual or institutional. The faculty members did not use such terms explicitly, but the terms captured best what the faculty members perceived as the motivations behind their colleagues' treatment of them.

When I started this study I believed that race was salient for the faculty members. I found that it was not only salient but central to the faculty members' definitions of themselves. Our discussion of promotion and tenure provided a catalyst for discussing their lives, in which race and racism provided powerful symbols. They saw their lives in race-based terms, partly because they had very strong racial identities as illustrated by the terms they chose to identify themselves (e.g., *"faculty of color," "minority professional," "Black man," "Asian woman," "Brown person," "African American woman"*). But they also perceived that race was reflected back at them by others—for example, by their colleagues, who had race-based expectations of them (e.g., that they conduct race-related work), and by institutional arrangements (e.g., affirmative action). This reflection was both positive

and negative. It was positive in that they saw themselves in positions to talk about race and to work for their racial communities. They felt as well that a large number of Whites appreciated this. It was negative in that they felt that many Whites' perceptions of people of color were based on harmful stereotypes. And they believed they were not allowed to ever forget that they were first and foremost people of color in a world controlled by Whites.

The faculty members' underrepresentation in the institution, and the isolation resulting from this, contributed to the salience of race in their perceptions. Each was often the only faculty of color in a department. Also, the few faculty of color at the institution were scattered among its numerous departments. The salience of any aspect of a person's self-concept is influenced by its relative "distinctiveness" in the immediate social environment (See McGuire, McGuire, Child, & Fujioka, 1978). So, being a person of color in a predominantly White environment makes one's race salient. But the "distinctiveness" concept does not explain why race was central for the faculty members. Asserting their racial identities allowed them to cope with an isolating, and in some cases hostile, environment (Lal, 1995). Furthermore, a racial minority group's self-consciousness is enhanced by shared experiences of discrimination and social disadvantage (Hutnik, 1991). The faculty members' perceptions, therefore, were influenced not only by the value systems inherited from their racial groups, and from what they experienced inside and outside of academia, but also by the knowledge, ingrained since childhood, that people of color in this society experience racism and discrimination. So, in interpreting the promotion and tenure process, race and racism would provide powerful symbols for them.

Even though racism was salient in the faculty members' perspectives of the promotion and tenure process, they did not talk about racism in the same way. In fact, two faculty members indicated that they did not experience racism at the institution, and two did not feel that it was the

most important struggle for them. For example, one African American full professor felt that although racism was present in academia, some faculty of color have made a *"mountain out of a mole hill."* One of the weaknesses of many studies and other scholarly publications dealing with racism in academia (See e.g., Anderson, 1988; Collins, 1990; Jackson, 1991; Reyes & Halcon, 1991; Staples, 1984; Sutherland, 1990) is that they "essentialize" faculty of color; that is, the differences among individual faculty of color are not adequately addressed. We need to recognize the instability and heterogeneity of racial categories and meanings, and the ways that race, class, and gender intersect in the construction of social identities (Gregory, 1996). Furthermore, the literature tends to also "essentialize" Whites. Often, all White colleagues, especially White males, are seen as intentional or unintentional oppressors. Clearly, the successes of faculty of color could not have occurred without the support of Whites in positions of power. And the faculty members in this study who attained tenure acknowledged this. Symbolic interactionism lets us see that while group definitions are important, it is important to also focus on how individuals define their situations because this provides insight into how people challenge prevailing notions of race.

At any rate, fourteen faculty members indicated that they experienced racism in some form or another. Although many of the faculty members perceived individual racism (10), the majority of the faculty members (14) felt victimized by a promotion and tenure process that impacted faculty of color negatively. Professional status was not related to how they felt about individual or institutional racism. Of the fourteen faculty members perceiving racism, seven were tenured. Despite attaining success in the ways defined by academia (i.e,. attaining tenure), race was an important symbol for interpreting their interaction with colleagues.

Individual Racism

Ten faculty members (five tenured) attributed some of their difficulties in attaining promotion or tenure to individual racism, even if they did not specifically make such a reference. These faculty members believed that their colleagues treated them as if they *"did not belong"* at the institution. A few faculty members used stronger words to describe the interaction with their colleagues (e.g., *"This department is hostile;" "White folks look at me with an air of challenge or invisibility;" "I feel like a second-class citizen;"* and *"They try to undermine your confidence in so many ways"*). The symbols the faculty members' interpreted as individual racism were not insults. The important symbols for them included: (1) the fact that there were very few people of color in non-custodial or non-clerical positions; (2) the few professionals of color were scattered throughout the institution; (3) the rhetoric of affirmative action forced them to justify their presence; (4) they perceived that Whites were treated differently; (5) they rarely saw a department tenure more than one faculty of color; and (6) some White liberals punished them for not conforming to their expectations (e.g., a tenured Latino faculty member related an incident in which his department chair criticized him for not participating in "minority organizations"). Some of the most important symbols, however, were subtle slights from their colleagues. For example, most of the faculty members felt excluded from their colleagues' social activities but believed that White faculty members were not. Four faculty members even felt ignored by their colleagues (e.g., their colleagues would not talk to them in the halls).

The most important symbol of individual racism for the faculty members, however, was the "stigma" of affirmative action. The faculty members believed that their colleagues and students believed them to be unqualified because they benefitted from affirmative action. The perception is strong that White students, staff, and faculty members are being discriminated against as a result of

affirmative action (See e.g., Cahn, 1993; Chronicle of Higher Education, 1995; Smith & Sneed, 1989; Smith & Witt, 1990), although there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1997; see also Aguirre, Martinez, & Hernandez, 1993; Washington & Harvey, 1989). The rhetoric of affirmative action appears to frame the discussion in politically conservative terms, so we hear it discussed in terms of "lack of qualifications," "reverse discrimination," and "quotas." This has the unfortunate consequence of forcing faculty of color to defend their presence on college campuses rather than actively fighting racism and discrimination.

Symbolic interactionism explains that how racial groups define themselves and others is not merely a question of culture; it is a strategic device for facilitating a greater share of resources (Lal, 1995). By framing affirmative action in terms of competence, rather than as remedying past discrimination, opponents can use affirmative action deliberately to further discrimination (See Milward, et al., 1983). For example, Bell (1987) pointed out that the frequent "complaint 'we can't find any qualified blacks' may be proof that the affirmative-action policy is serving its real, though unacknowledged, goal: excluding all but a token number of minorities from opportunities that previously were available only to whites" (p. 8). Furthermore, framing the issue in terms of competence disguises an underlying perception about people of color: that they are inferior to Whites, and as such, do not deserve a proportionate share of this society's resources.

The faculty members referred to being stigmatized by affirmative action, but the stigmatizing attribute here was race—what the faculty members meant was that they were stigmatized by race and victimized by individual racism. A stigma is an attribute that is deeply discrediting; one that reduces the possessor in our minds "from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one" (Goffman, 1963, p. 3; See also Katz, 1981). But an attribute is not credible or discredible in itself; the social context is crucial for defining and maintaining stigmas (Goffman,

1963). In this society, collective definitions of race maintain Whites' dominance over non-Whites (Lal, 1995), and this dominance is justified by symbols that have defined non-Whites as inferior. As Sanjek (1996) contended, as part of centuries old racial categorization and racial social ordering, people today accept the systemic inequalities of racist social orders as based on real differences among races. Academia is a social institution subject to the same symbols and patterns of behavior that govern elsewhere. Academic symbols (e.g., the values of merit and individualism) are interpreted in a historically validated context of White hegemony. Faculty of color, as racial minorities, carry the stigma of race. Furthermore, because they benefit from affirmative action, which appears to violate academia's traditional values of merit and individualism, they are deemed undeserving of their positions.

Institutional Racism

Despite their perceptions of individual racism, 12 faculty members indicated that institutional racism was their greatest challenge (2 others believed that it was as great a burden as other things). The faculty members saw the promotion and tenure process as structurally racist because its criteria, policies, practices did not take into account their unique struggles (e.g., the isolation experienced because of their underrepresentation) and interests (e.g., working for their racial communities).

The symbols they interpreted as institutional racism did not explicitly represent racism. For example, the faculty members perceived racism because: (1) the most important criterion for tenure (i.e., excellence in scholarship) was the hardest for them to meet given the lack of support, their underrepresentation, and the race-based expectations their colleagues had of them (e.g., that they serve on *"diversity"* committees, teach *"diversity"* courses, and mentor students of color); (2) their work was devalued (e.g., their research was not considered legitimate if it challenged established

theories of race, or if it was not published in mainstream journals; and the service they performed was not considered important); (3) traditional academic values hampered them (e.g., they felt hampered by individualism because they felt more comfortable working collaboratively); (4) the way the promotion and tenure criteria were measured impacted them negatively (e.g., the reliance on external reviewers was seen as unfair because outside scholars did not value their research; and the reliance on student evaluations was also seen as unfair because they believed they were rated less positively by students than their White colleagues).

The faculty members' construction of racism was interesting because they were able to separate their feelings about the process from those for their colleagues. They saw the promotion and tenure process as racist, but many of them thought their colleagues were *"good people."* They felt that their colleagues were uncomfortable with what faculty of color represented to them but were not overtly racist. They believed their White colleagues did not recognize the barriers that prevented better representation of faculty of color in academia (e.g., reliance on publications, or the Ph.D. requirement) or see how isolation, lack of feedback, and lack of support were magnified for faculty of color. But the faculty members did not want to see their colleagues as racists (this was despite the fact that many felt their colleagues saw them as unqualified); they merely blamed them for not seeing how difficult it was to be a person of color in White academia or for not seeing the inherent racism of the tenure process.

It may seem strange at first glance that the faculty members could perceive the promotion and tenure process as racist but not their colleagues. What informs this perception? Symbolic interactionism provides an explanation. By seeing the promotion and tenure process as a "generalized other" the faculty members were able to interact with it without having to see the process as particular individuals deliberately acting to discriminate against them. So, they could see

the process as racist, while still believing that most of their colleagues were *"good people."* They could have seen, but did not, that their colleagues not only defended the tenure process but enforced it as well. By seeing the promotion and tenure process as a racist "generalized other," the faculty members could "de-personalize" it and see themselves victimized by racism without pointing to any incident of overt individual racism.

Most of the faculty members were reticent about directly attributing their problems to racism. For example, an untenured African American faculty member, in discussing negative evaluation comments he received after his mid-term review (e.g., that he was *unapproachable* to students), explained why he suspected racism in the promotion and tenure process:

> *And so I know these things happen. Just as I know that when I walk into a store dressed basically the way I am, [casually], I'm going to be looked at more suspiciously than a White male walking into the store wearing the same clothes....I haven't experienced as many of these things on the professional level, so I'm still trying to say, no, it can't be....I'm working to make a non-racial attribution, and it's not happening.*

Symbolic interactionism provides an explanation for this reticence. Constructing meaning in academia required the faculty members to interpret conflicting sets of symbols that carried different meanings of how success is attained. In other words, the academic symbols of merit and individualism conflicted with those that made up their racial groups' definitions of race. The faculty members understood academia to function as a meritocracy and wanted to believe that they were being judged on the basis of merit. Meritocracies are presumed to be immune from the stereotypes that influence interracial activity in other social institutions. On the other hand, they learned from their racial groups that race, more than any other construct, influences the relative positions of racial groups and any institution controlled by Whites is not immune from racism. It appeared that the symbols associated with race carried deeper meaning for them.

Their reluctance to explicitly attribute racism to their problems may also be partly explained by how they defined racism—as more institutional than individual. This way of seeing racism did not require them to see their colleagues as racist or even to experience individual racism. The faculty member making the comment above provides some explanation why—without dealing with overt forms of individual racism—these faculty members still believed that racism characterized their promotion and tenure experiences. The faculty members' perceptions were informed by their experiences as people of color in this country. As the faculty member above indicated, they were subjected to racism in other aspects of their lives. The faculty members also came to the institution with the knowledge—ingrained since childhood—that racial minorities in this country are subjected to racism and discrimination. This knowledge, reinforced by their personal experiences inside and outside of academia, informed the faculty members' perceptions of the promotion and tenure process. So any struggle, any challenge, or even any slight by colleagues, reinforced their belief in the inherent racism of the promotion and tenure process, even if the motives behind these actions were not intended to be perceived as such.

Negotiating Racism

Reyes and Halcon (1988) provided useful concepts that shed some light into the ways the faculty members in this study negotiated racism. They explained that Chicano faculty deal with racism in a number of ways. They may "give in" to the demands to assimilate and divest themselves of all apparent cultural traits. Some "give up;" these faculty members use up all their energies combating racism and leave academia altogether. Some faculty members decide the struggle is not worth the consequences at a particular institution and "move on" to "greener pastures" at another institution. Others "fight back," but recognize their limitations and the importance of succeeding in the system. These faculty members carefully "pick" their fights.

Finally, some faculty members also "fight back" but exert every effort to challenge racism and lose their tenure bids.

The faculty members in this study negotiated racism in similar ways. But there were some differences. No faculty member in this study "gave in;" that is, there was no evidence that the faculty members divested themselves of cultural traits. In fact, they had strong racial identities. No faculty member talked about leaving academia. No faculty member "moved on" in the same way that Reyes and Halcon discussed; although some of the faculty members in this study left previous positions for "greener pastures," it was usually after failing to attain promotion or tenure. Furthermore, the manner in which each of the faculty members negotiated these battles was seen by each as promoting his or her success. This is why I chose the word "strategies" to describe how the faculty members negotiated and resisted racism; they chose one of a number of possible alternatives and did so after weighing the consequences. Some of the strategies, however, appeared to be more successful than others in the long run (i.e., according to the other faculty members in this study and the research literature).

Strategies Used When Confronting Individual Racism

The strategies in this section were those that were directed at their colleagues, although the incidents that sparked them may not have been those perceived as motivated by individual racism. The faculty members, however, were conscious of the ways they dealt with individual racism because this forced them to make a quick decision about whether or not to confront their colleagues. The faculty members were less able to talk about this negotiation when they dealt with institutional racism, but it appears that they managed it in similar ways and also used other strategies.

Doing Nothing: "Giving Up?"

Three untenured African American faculty members indicated that often they chose to do nothing when they encountered racism; that is, they chose not to confront their colleagues. For example, an untenured African American faculty member, who suspected racism when he was asked to promote a program from which he was discouraged from participating, explained why he would not confront the chairperson:

> *I will give [the chairperson] my reasons if asked. You can call it passive-aggressive behavior if you want to—it probably is. But it's a real hot button for me. If I go down there and talk about it, I'm going to get mad. And I don't want to get mad about it. I just want to ignore it—pretend like it's not there. If somebody wants to bring it up then the situation changes.*

This faculty member indicated that he did not want to get angry, but outwardly he seemed to be angry anyway. Bronstein, Rothblum, and Solomon (1993) contended that internalization of social-oppression may cause individuals to become self-denigrating and self-limiting in thoughts and behaviors. Furthermore, as the other faculty members explained, doing nothing does not change a bad situation. Racism left unchallenged will continue.

The faculty members who did nothing when faced with racism exhibited some, but not all, the characteristics consistent with Reyes and Halcon's "giving up." Reyes and Halcon explained that such faculty members become so demoralized by the futility of the struggle that they leave academia altogether. The three faculty members in this study who did nothing were not completely confident that they would be tenured, and they appeared somewhat demoralized, but they believed they were acting in their best interests. None indicated a intention to leave academia. Even if they did not succeed at the university, they felt they were learning lessons about surviving the promotion and tenure process at another institution.

These three faculty members resisted racism the best way they knew how. They had reasons for not being confrontational about racism (e.g., they were afraid of getting too angry or

appearing overly sensitive). One possible difference between those who confronted racism and those who did not was that the latter were non-confrontational by nature. It is also possible that they assessed their situations and realized that to challenge racism would be too costly. One faculty member, for example, implied that her colleagues would not forgive her if she confronted them with her suspicions. At any rate, these faculty members believed they were acting in ways that allowed them to survive the promotion and tenure process.

Fighting Back: "You Lose Big Time"

Three faculty members interviewed showed characteristics similar to those faculty members Reyes and Halcon (1988) classified as sacrificing their careers by "fighting back." In this study, the faculty members classified as "fighting back," acted in a manner consistent with that explained by Reyes and Halcon, except that these faculty members did not believe they were sacrificing their careers. These faculty members were different also from those described below as "picking and choosing their battles" in that these faculty members constantly challenged racism without regarding the risks of doing so. Of the three faculty members in this category, one was tenured and the other two did not attain tenure. These three faculty members believed they were acting in their best interests. Even the two who failed to attain tenure indicated they had learned lessons that would help them in future academic positions.

Most of the faculty members believed that if racist behavior was left unchallenged, it would persist. For most of these faculty members, it was impossible not to speak up when they encountered racism—at least on some occasions. As one tenured Latino explained, *"It's ridiculous to say, "empowerment—my class, empowerment for the underdog," and then to sit at a faculty meeting and listen to the bull shit that goes on, and not say, "Hey, the emperor doesn't have any clothes."* Challenging racism is necessary for surviving discrimination. The history of oppressed racial groups in this country shows

that they have survived because they have resisted racism (e.g., the resistance against legalized segregation in the 1960s). Not challenging racism might appear to them as inappropriate given their historically validated subordination to Whites.

Constantly challenging perceived racism, however, had serious consequences for the three faculty members in this category. For example, the untenured Asian American faculty member below believed that confronting racism meant *"losing big time"*:

> *If you decide you're not going to sell out—I'm going to confront these people, and force them to realize that their liberalism is really...vicious in some way—even if they are good people—then you get accused of not knowing how to be a liberal, not knowing how to be an academic, or using your emotions against logic. And you lose big time.*

This faculty member did not attain tenure. Another untenured Asian American faculty member perceived being *"labeled hostile"* for bringing up issues of race and gender in the promotion and tenure process and also failed to attain tenure. The one tenured faculty member in this category, a Latino, felt that his colleagues intentionally isolated him from social events. That there were consequences for negotiating racism in this manner was not surprising. Helms (1990) indicated that members of racial minorities can influence the dominant group but a rigid negotiation style will discredit them.

Faculty members who fight back at all may pay the consequences. The tenure system has survived because we have come to accept the meaning of its symbols (e.g., that hard work and merit determine success). When faculty of color challenge the tenure system as racist, they are challenging important symbols and patterns of interpretation, which have maintained advantages for White men. Some Whites, those making a powerful majority in academia, might also feel threatened by these challenges because this forces them to question their successes, how they gained those successes, and how they behave towards people of color. At any rate, the faculty members in this study felt the risks associated with challenging racism.

Reyes and Halcon (1988) indicated that the faculty members who "fight back," but fail, believed they have been acting to effect significant change. This seemed to describe the faculty members in this category. The two untenured faculty members believed the *"fight was worth it,"* because as one stated, *"I have altered the institution because I have forced it to confront to some degree the fact that it's racist."* The tenured faculty member also saw his strategy as important, seeing himself as *"standing up for the underdog."* These three faculty members saw their actions as one of benefitting their racial groups, and they perceived themselves as trying to right injustices and as champions of a cause.

Surviving the Process: "Picking and Choosing Battles"

Eight faculty members, six tenured, did not see "fighting back" as completely detrimental to the attainment of tenure, provided faculty of color *"pick and choose [their] battles."* "Doing nothing" was rejected as being too costly psychologically, and "fighting back" constantly was seen as too costly professionally. The faculty members in this category learned to *"pick and choose"* their battles by striking a balance between not *"putting people off"* and *"staying true."*

Reyes and Halcon (1988) argued that faculty members who "fight back" by "picking their fights" carefully evaluated their situations, taking into consideration the key players and levels of support, and the odds of succeeding. These faculty members maintain a strong affiliation with their ethnic communities, recognize the manifestations of racism, and challenge them. They comply with "rules" only insofar as that will earn them tenure; once they attain tenure they redirect their attention to "minority concerns" and "minority-related" research. In this study, the eight faculty members placed in this category did not wait until they attained tenure to challenge racism; they felt that the consequences of waiting for tenure were too great. They fought back, but did so without

compromising their integrity or ethnicity; in other words, they fought back strategically. They balanced the necessity of challenging racism with the risk to their careers.

While they negotiated the promotion and tenure process in this manner, they were not always able to talk explicitly about the cognitive process of *"picking and choosing battles."* For most, this was subconsciously done. Apparently, the strategy was learned, but some part of it might have involved intuition. The untenured African American faculty member below spoke about this in terms of a *"sixth sense"*:

> *You have to have sort of a sixth sense about those things for a number of reasons. One, is your own credibility. You don't want to be perceived as a one-issue person. But you also don't want people to mistake the fact that this is a primary concern, not just for you but for the institution....So you have to have a sense of the timing and setting of when it makes sense to bring those things up.*

For this faculty member, picking her fights involved some intuition. It also involved taking into consideration *"timing and setting."* As Reyes and Halcon (1988) also implied, the process of *"picking and choosing battles"* was a deductive one; it involved the weighing of consequences. The faculty members evaluated their situations and the odds of succeeding before acting.

The decision to "fight back" involved negotiating their battles with themselves, so as not to *"hate yourself,"* and with others, so as not to be *"labeled hostile."* In other words, the decision *to fight* had to allow them to maintain their credibility, which meant not *"putting people off."* At the same time, the faculty members had to keep their integrity intact; so the decision *not to fight* could not cause them to see themselves as betraying their race or themselves (described by one tenured faculty members as *"staying true").* These faculty members decided early in their careers which things were *"worth fighting for"* (e.g., most believed that it was worth fighting overt discrimination) and which were *"not worth the trouble"* (e.g., the under-appreciation of institutional service); everything else had to be placed on a continuum along that line. Although negotiating the balance may have been difficult, they felt that it was crucial for their survival. The successful faculty members learned

this early on in their careers because they were mentored by other faculty of color. Mentoring, therefore, especially by other faculty of color, is crucial for junior faculty members.

Other Strategies for Resisting Institutional Racism

In conceptualizing how the faculty members resisted institutional racism, it is important to see that the faculty members saw the tenure process as a "generalized other;" that is, they saw this process as separate from the individuals that made decisions within it. This allowed them to do two things: (1) to perceive racism without having to see their colleagues (which they often liked) as racist; and (2) to resist racism in ways that they believed their colleagues might not consider as a personal challenge. The strategies used in resisting institutional racism, therefore, were not directed at individuals (as they might have been when confronting individual racism).

Despite the fact that the faculty members in this study negotiated racism in different ways, all resisted racism. In many ways, their mere presence on a predominantly White campus was a form of resistance against the structural barriers that usually keep out people of color. People of color are seriously underrepresented in academia (Carter & O'Brien, 1993) and in most professions (Tang & Smith, 1996). Faculty of color make up only 13.2% of all full-time faculty members (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1997). People of color are not choosing academic careers in great numbers (Bjork & Thompson, 1984), and the few who do face serious struggles in graduate school (Bronstein, Rothblum, & Solomon, 1993). Once they arrive on college campuses, they struggle with racism, isolation, and a lack of support (Boice, 1993). Despite all these barriers, the faculty members in this study were resilient. When they were forced to leave one institution, they found success at another one (e.g., three faculty members were denied promotion and tenure elsewhere but found greater success at the university). Although these faculty members believed their struggles were caused by racism, they chose instead to resist it rather than give up.

"Playing the Game"

One of the ways the tenured faculty members resisted the institutional racism embedded in the promotion and tenure process was by learning to *"play the game."* As one tenured full professor indicated, the key to surviving the tenure process was to *"figure out how the game was played. And if I learned how to play the game, I could survive."* These faculty members knew that they could not see the promotion and tenure system as unnegotiable. They chose to treat it as a *"game"* with *"rules"* and *"players"* that had to be understood and managed. This "game" metaphor is important. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explained in Metaphors We Live By , metaphors are more than linguistic expressions; metaphors help us understand complex social processes. In framing the tenure process as a "game," the faculty members saw themselves as able to negotiate a racist power structure, feeling that they had some control over what happened to them (e.g., *"And if I learned to play the game, I could survive"*).

Finding Support

Most of the faculty members learned that finding supportive colleagues—preferably in the department, but if not there then elsewhere—was crucial for surviving the promotion and tenure process. They needed support that helped them attain tenure (e.g., helping them understand the *"game,"* reading their drafts, helping them get published, helping them present at professional conferences, etc.). They also needed interpersonal support (e.g., *"someone to talk to"*). As one tenured faculty member explained, *"You need a sounding board to know when you're on target and when you're not. You need to discuss these issues with other people whose judgement you trust."* The *"sounding board"* provided validation, which was especially important when they felt victimized by racism.

The *"sounding board"* and having *"someone to talk to"* primarily referred to other faculty of color, especially those outside of the institution and those they met at professional conferences.

They resisted racism by forming or joining networks of other faculty of color, who provided professional and interpersonal support. For example, this tenured African American professor explained why her network of African American women were important to her:

> *I think there's something else at work too....And that is the problem of releasing things to people who are going to make judgements on them before they're finished. And I think in many ways, for faculty of color, there have to be places of safety in which you can do that. So you don't hold on to it until you think it's perfect, because then you don't get enough out....Or you do it and it just misses the mark completely, and you find out at tenure and promotion time rather than at a point where you had some opportunity for remedial steps. So I think it's important that we have places where we look at each other's work.*

This faculty member's comments illustrated the distrust these faculty members held generally for their departmental colleagues. The faculty members believed that networks of other faculty of color would provide them with *"risk-free"* evaluation of their work, a situation not usually found in their departments. This feedback could be trusted because these professionals were not in competition with each other, and these networks were specifically formed to help faculty of color.

The faculty members also resisted racism by taking personal responsibility for finding support. As one tenured faculty member indicated, *"It is difficult to reach out. It should be up to [your colleagues] to reach out. But you have to see it as your responsibility."* These faculty members assumed this responsibility because they felt they had to. They did not believe they would be helped by most of their White colleagues, who they perceived as not understanding how the tenure process was structurally racist. This required that they take an assertive stance. For example, the tenured faculty member below explained what faculty of color had to do to survive in an environment where publishing was of the utmost importance:

> *You're going to have to discipline yourself to force other people to talk to you. Even if they don't want to. Get in the habit of not being invited, but shoving yourself through the door and saying, "Read this, and tell me what you think."...You got to be able to force yourself on people, I think, and overcome the social insecurity that's part of the normal baggage that people feel. So I think that's the hardest thing to do, but it's necessary, absolutely necessary.*

Most studies of faculty of color in predominantly White institutions appear to place the onus for ensuring support strictly on the institution (Blackwell, 1988; Boice, 1992; Bronstein, 1993; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Moody, 1988; Tack & Patitu, 1992). These faculty members believed that the university had some responsibility for supporting them, but they negotiated institutional racism by assuming primary responsibility for their support.

Mentoring Others

The tenured faculty members also negotiated institutional racism by taking an active role in the professional development of junior faculty of color. They hoped to nurture young professionals so that they would have the skills to challenge the *"system."* They felt responsible for ensuring that these faculty members succeeded. Furthermore, all the faculty members mentored students of color, especially doctoral students, even if the students were not their official advisees. They tried to educate these students about institutional racism, hoping that they would form collectives that sought institutional change.

The faculty members understood that to resist racism, they had to conceptualize the problem at the structural rather than individual level. They knew that it would take the great effort of many people to change academia, and this effort would need to be maintained for a long time. By ensuring that other students and faculty of color survived academia, these faculty members hoped that a critical mass of people of color would form, and these individuals would challenge the system, questioning its tenets and guaranteeing that others after them have a much less difficult time.

Defining the Criteria in Ways Benefitting Their Communities

The faculty members' most important strategy for resisting institutional racism was by defining the promotion and tenure criteria in ways that benefitted their racial communities. For

example, although the faculty members knew that there were risks to conducting race-related work, they felt that this work was crucial to the survival of faculty of color. So fourteen of the faculty members dealt with *"race"* issues in their scholarship (the other two indicated they were *"interested"* in this as well). *"Race research"* was important to them because they felt they had to challenge established ways of thinking about race, which were seen as *"racist," "classist," and "sexist."* This was so important to them that they insisted on conducting this work:

> *If you look at the major journals in my field, they aren't dealing with race issues. And I'm trying to deal with these issues. I don't know if it's threatening—well, I don't want to flatter myself—but it's definitely something people don't want to talk about. And I insist on talking about that.*

The faculty members' actions could be considered a strategy because they perceived that by conducting this research the established theories developed by White men would become obsolete, thus requiring a new set of faculty members who were ready to assume leadership in these areas. They were also hoping to pave the way for junior faculty of color, so that they would have less difficulty proving that their scholarship was legitimate.

A number of scholars have indicated that race research is undervalued by White academia (Anderson, 1988; Blackwell, 1988; Reyes & Halcon, 1988) and others have claimed that White males are threatened by this type of research because it threatens their positions as gatekeepers of true knowledge (Bronstein, 1993). Although the faculty members understood the risks, their insistence on conducting race-related research evidenced resistance to a promotion and tenure process that defined the criteria in ways that benefitted White men.

The faculty members were also cognizant of the risks associated with "minority-related" service. There has been extensive discussion in the literature about the risks associated with engaging in too much service and of engaging in "minority-related" service (See Banks, 1984; Johnsrud, 1993; Reyes and Halcon, 1988). Although the tenured faculty members were careful in

selecting appropriate activities—as opposed to engaging in too many activities—all of the faculty members served their racial communities, on and off campus. The service they insisted on performing had political benefits for their racial groups. As symbolic interactionism explains, people of color will engage in ethnic institutions to facilitate a greater share in society's resources (Lal, 1995). As far as institutional service was concerned, the faculty members saw the importance of providing their *"voice"* in institutional affairs. They saw themselves responsible for being *"vigilant"* about race issues, and as a result, they felt they had to become involved in institutional governance. They also represented the interests of students and faculty of color on institutional committees. By being involved in this kind of work, they believed they ensured that overt racism, at least, was diminished. They also sought to advance group interests so that faculty of color would compete more effectively with Whites. Their race-related work, therefore, was not conduct merely because it was personally important to them; they also sought political gain.

The faculty members, therefore, resisted institutional racism by defining the promotion and tenure criteria in ways that benefitted their racial communities. Despite the risks associated with race-related work, the faculty members believed they were acting in ways that ensured their success or that paved the way for other faculty of color. They resisted the notion that they should not engage in race-related work because, as one faculty member indicated, *"it's a part of who we are."* As symbolic interactionism postulates, racial minorities resist the societal structures that have maintained their subordination to Whites, and in doing so, they can act in ways not foreseen by Whites (Lal, 1995). Their unwavering insistence on pursuing this work evidenced a resistance to a promotion and tenure process that was perceived as structurally racist because it did not recognize or appreciate the special interests of faculty of color.

Conclusion and Recommendations

One of the goals of this paper is to help frame the discussion about faculty of color and racism in ways that do not make them appear as helpless victims of a racist power structure. Though most of the faculty members saw the promotion and tenure process as racist, none wanted to be seen as victims. This was true also of those faculty members who failed to attain tenure. Some blamed particular individuals for their struggles; others blamed the *system.*" But they did not blame themselves, or think themselves unworthy of attaining tenure. In fact, many of them believed that they had to be better than their White colleagues to attain tenure and set standards that were considerably higher than everyone else's. This thinking could have consequences. For example, Banks (1984) explained that the pressure to work harder can facilitate intellectual performance, but only at the expense of faculty members' personal and social lives. But the faculty members did not see the issue this way. They saw the need to feel this way as psychologically necessary to survive racism.

The faculty members negotiated and resisted racism the best way they knew how. When they believed their colleagues were motivated by individual racism, their strategies were directed at them. But the most important form of racism for them was institutional, and so their negotiating strategies were directed at the "generalized other" of their environment. The faculty members' construction of racism was important because it provides some evidence of what Blauner (1993) explained about racism: that Whites and people of color define it differently. He contended that Whites define racism in terms of overt individual acts of discrimination that were common before the 1960s. People of color's definition of racism, on the other hand, encompasses the "atmospheric" racism of a social situation, and they see society, or a particular aspect of it, as racist simply because they do not share equally in the distribution of power. Blauner argued that because

Whites see racism differently, and are turned off by the over-heated racism discourse, they have come to see the "reverse discrimination" of affirmative action as the most important form of racism.

This difference in how racism is perceived is important. For one thing, White faculty members may not realize that they may be sending out unintended messages to faculty of color. And by understanding how faculty of color see racism, White faculty members would be better able to help them and not see them as overly sensitive. More important, relying on a definition of racism that emphasizes personal prejudice may not call into question the wider system of discrimination (Brown, 1985). Prejudicial attitudes, Blauner (1972) argued over three decades ago, are not the essence of racism—these attitudes are not necessary for maintaining a racist social structure. Racism, Blauner argued, has been institutionalized; that is, the processes that maintain White dominance over non-Whites are built into our major social institutions.

Different definitions of racism create social conflict. This conflict, however, need not be negatively conceptualized. Symbolic interactionism provides a framework for understanding social conflict and for resolving it. It views social interaction as a formative process (Blumer, 1969); thus, individuals' interpretations are presented to others, and others' views are taken into consideration. This process allows the conflict created by different definitions to be resolved. This will not be easy when it comes to race. The negative symbols associated with race have been institutionalized by the large number of people who have a stake in maintaining them. But symbolic interactionism gives us hope for understanding how individuals do change society. If we are to improve race relations in academia and create a more supportive environment for faculty of color, we need to construct a common understanding of race in higher education. With a common understanding we

can work together to eliminate the barriers that exclude people of color from full participation in academia.

Racism is a difficult challenge to overcome, but perhaps the lessons learned from the faculty members in this study can help us. Doing nothing or doing too much may not be appropriate strategies for resisting racism; there may be times when it is best to use one's energies in a different way. Without specifically referring to negotiating strategies, McKay's (1988) advice may be sound. She argued that when students exhibit racist behavior, faculty of color should make it clear to them that such behavior will not be tolerated. When colleagues exhibit such behavior, she advocated acting unexpectedly (e.g., being silent when sounding off appears clear). Knowing when to challenge such behavior is not easy, however, there are times when confrontation would not only be inappropriate but detrimental to one's career. *"Picking and choosing your battles"* may be a better strategy. Faculty of color may feel that it is unfair to have to bear this burden, but this responsibility must nevertheless be taken seriously.

We hear too often talk about combating racism and creating an environment supportive for people of color, but little is done to ensure that the organizational culture discourages racism and discrimination. We need to create symbols that will help us change prevailing definitions of race. Symbolic interactionism recognizes the crucial role of leadership in maintaining or challenging prevailing definitions of social situations (Lal, 1995). Thus, institutional leaders should follow their rhetoric and help create environments that promote diversity or multiculturalism by: (1) ensuring that institutional missions reflect this goal; (2) ensuring that White faculty members and administrators are educated about racism and its destructive and costly results; (3) making clear to the campus community that all faculty members are hired under the most exacting review and that their qualifications are excellent; (4) exposing hidden agendas, such as quotas on the number of

faculty of color per department; and (5) ensuring that the faculty reward system reflects the goals of multiculturalism. These suggestions will not, by themselves, change prevailing definitions that currently emphasize personal prejudice. But focusing our concern on those unconscious practices that create advantages for White men and disadvantages for everyone else will move us in the right direction.

Changing prevailing definitions is not going to be easy. The values of individualism and merit are examples of academic symbols that are so revered that questioning them exposes individuals to punishment or ridicule. Still, these values may be disguising discrimination. Abel (1987), in her study of faculty women filing gender discrimination lawsuits, pointed out that the ideals which reward individual talent and effort forces women to "couch their cases in individualistic terms, focusing more on their own personal and professional qualities than on systematic patterns of discrimination" (p. 347). This applies as well to faculty of color. Furthermore, by insisting that academia is a meritocracy, we may be permitting unfettered discrimination because the "society-wide hierarchical organization of institutional life" functions in academia as in other social institutions (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988). Academia is not immune from negative definitions of race.

There is little accountability in academia (unlike other social institutions, such as businesses and governmental agencies) because we are shielded by revered academic principles, such as, for example, the confidentiality of peer review, which is believed to be protected by "academic freedom." Thus, gender and racial discrimination may be protected by practices reinforced by apparently neutral values. Symbolic interactionism recognizes the will of individuals in constructing their environments. Academic values, and the practices based on them, therefore, are not neutral;

they are meant to maintain control of who "get's in." We can change how we define success in academia, but first we need to acknowledge that discrimination occurs and do something about it.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) argued that the "tenure system as it exists in the late twentieth century is in need of dramatic overhaul" (p. 125). We can start by questioning revered academic symbols. It is imperative that we not give legitimacy to academic practices and beliefs that maintain advantages for White men and disadvantages for everyone else. In addition to questioning the insistence on a meritocracy and the confidentiality of peer review, why not question the "seven-year up or out rule," the insistence on "excellence in scholarship" (defined in a limited way and conveniently subjective) over teaching and service, and perhaps even the doctoral degree requirement for entry into the profession. Perhaps these practices are legitimate; that is, we may come to a consensus that we should continue them. But without looking at their impact on faculty of color, and everyone else, we not only may be perpetuating racism but also may be acting in a shortsighted manner given the demographic changes in this society.

References

Abel, E. (1987). Collective protest and the meritocracy: Faculty women and sex discrimination lawsuits. In M. J. Deegan, & M. R. Hill (Eds.), Women and symbolic interaction (pp. 347-377). Boston: Allen & Unwin, Inc.

Aguirre, A., Hernandez, A., & Martinez, R. (1994). Perceptions of the workplace: Focus on minority women faculty. Initiatives, 56(3), 41-50.

Aguirre, A., & Martinez, R. O. (1993). Chicanos in higher education: Issues and dilemmas for the 21st Century. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

Aguirre, A., Martinez, R., & Hernandez, A. (1993). Majority and minority faculty perceptions in academe. Research in Higher Education, 34(3), 371-385.

Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Alperson, E. D. (1975). The minority woman in academe. Professional Psychology, 6(3), 252-256.

Anderson, T. (1988). Black encounter of racism and elitism in White academe: A critique of the system. Journal of Black Studies, 18(3), 259-272.

Banks, W. M. (1984). Afro-American scholars in the university: Roles and conflicts. American Behavioral Scientist, 27(3), 325-338.

Bassett, P. (1992). Resolving pink and brown conflicts result. ıg from the White male system. In L. B. Welch (Ed.), Perspectives on minority women in higher education (pp. 13-22). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Bell, D. (1987). And we are not saved: The elusive quest for racial justice. New York: Basis Books, Inc.

Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bjork, L. G., & Thompson, T. E. (1989). The next generation of faculty: Minority issues. Education and Urban Society, 21(3), 341-351.

Blackwell, J. E. (1988). Faculty issues: The impact on minorities. The Review of Higher Education, 11(4), 417-434.

Blauner, R. (1972). Racial oppression in America. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Blauner, R. (1993). "But things are much worse for the Negro people:" Race and radicalism in my life and work. In J. H. Stanfield (Ed.), A history of race relations research: First generation recollections (pp. 1-36). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (2d ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boice, R. (1993). Early turning points in professional careers of women and minorities. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53 (Spring 1993), 71-79.

Boice, R. (1993a). New faculty involvement for women and minorities. Research in Higher Education, 34(3), 291-341.

Bronstein, P. (1993). Challenges, rewards, and costs for feminist and ethnic minority scholars. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53 (Spring 1993), 61-70.

Bronstein, P., Rothblum, E. D., & Solomon, S. E. (1993). Ivy halls and glass walls: Barriers to academic careers for women and ethnic minorities. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53 (Spring 1993), 17-31.

Brown, K. (1985). Turning a blind eye: Racial oppression and the unintended consequences of White "non-racism." The Sociological Review, 33(4), 670-690.

Cahn, S. M. (Ed.). (1993). Affirmative action and the university: A philosophical Inquiry. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Carter, D., & O'Brien, E. O. (1993). Employment and hiring patterns for faculty of color. ACE Research Briefs, 4(6). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 204)

Carter, D., Pearson, C., & Shavlik, D. (1988). Double jeopardy: Women of color in higher education. Educational Record, 68/69(4/1), 98-103.

Chavez, R. C., & Padilla, R. V. (1995). Introduction. In R. V. Padilla, & R. C. Chavez (Eds.), The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities (pp. 1-16). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1995, April 28). Affirmative action on the line. A12-A33.

Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac. (1997, August 29).

Collins, M. (1990). Enrollment, recruitment, and retention of minority faculty and staff in institutions of higher education. Action in Teacher Education, 12(3), 57-62.

Cross, W. E. Jr. (1991). Shades of Black: Diversity in African American identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Daly, F., & Townsend, B. K. (1992, October). Faculty perception of the department chair's role in facilitating tenure acquisition. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for

the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 912)

Deegan, M. J. (1987). Symbolic interaction and the study of women: An introduction. In M. J. Deegan, & M. R. Hill (Eds.), Women and symbolic interaction (pp. 3-15). Boston: Allen & Unwin, Inc.

Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Escuerta, E., & O'Brien, E. O. (1995). Asian Americans in higher education: Trends and issues. In D. T. Nakanishi & T. Y. Nishida (Eds.), The Asian American education experience: A source book for teachers and students (pp. 259-272). New York: Routledge.

Fine, G. A. (1993). The sad demise, mysterious disappearance, and glorious triumph of symbolic interactionism. In J. Blake, & J. Hagen (Eds.), Annual review of sociology, 19 (pp. 61-87). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gregory, S. T. (1995). Black women in the academy: The secrets to success and achievement. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Gregory, S. (1996). Race, rubbish, and resistance: Empowering difference in community politics. In S. Gregory, & R. Sanjek (Eds.), Race (pp. 366-391). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Harvey, W. B. (1987). An ebony view of the ivory tower: Memories of a Black faculty member. Change, 19(3), 46-49.

Helms, J. E. (1990). Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Greenwood Press.

Hutnik, N. (1991). Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, K. W. (1991). Black faculty in academia. In P. A. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), The racial crisis in American Higher Education (pp. 135-148). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnsrud, L. K. (1993). Women and minority faculty experiences: Defining and responding to diverse realities. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53 (Spring 1993), 3-16.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Atwater, C. D. (1993). Scaffolding the ivory tower: Building support for faculty new to the academy. CUPA Journal, 44(4), 1-14.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Des Jarlais, C. D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. The Review of Higher Education, 17(4), 335-353.

Katz, I. (1981). Stigma: A social psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaun Associates Publishers.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lal, B. B. (1955). Symbolic interaction theories. American Behavioral Scientist, 38(3), 421-441.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1988). Young, gifted and black. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Matthews, B. (1992). Networking and support for women of color. L. B. Welch (Ed.), Perspectives on minority women in higher education (pp. 9-11). New York: Praeger Publishers.

McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36(5), 511-520.

McKay, N. Y. (1983). Black woman professor—White university. Women's Studies International Forum, 6(2), 143-147.

McKay, N. Y. (1988). Minority faculty in [mainstream White] academia. In A. L. Deneef, C. D. Goodwin, & E. S. McCrate (Eds.), The academic's handbook (pp. 46-60). Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 54(2), 123-144.

Milward, H. B., Denhardt, K. G., Rucker, R. E., & Thomas, T. L. (1983). Implementing affirmative action and organizational compliance: The case of universities. Administration and Society, 15(3), 373-384.

Mindiola, T. (1995). Getting tenure at the U. In R. V. Padilla, & R. C. Chavez (Eds.), The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities (pp. 29-52). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Moody, Sr. , C. D. (1988). Strategies for improving the representation of minority faculty in research universities. Peabody Journal of Education, 66(1), 77-90.

Moses, Y. T. (1989). Black women in academe: Issues and strategies. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 817)

Nakanishi, D. T. (1993). Asian Pacific Americans in higher education: Faculty and administrative representation and tenure. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53 (Spring 1993), 51-59.

Olivas, M. A. (1988). Latino faculty at the border: Increasing numbers key to more Hispanic access. Change, May/June, 6-9.

Ransford, H. E. (1994). Race and class in American society: Black, Latino, Anglo (2d ed.). Rochester, VT: Schenkman Books, Inc.

Reyes, M. D. L., & Halcon, J. J. (1988). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. Harvard Educational Review, 58(3), 299-314.

Reyes, M. D. L., & Halcon, J. J. (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano Academics. In P. A. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), The racial crisis in American Higher Education (pp. 167-186). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sanjek, R. (1996). The enduring inequalities of race. In S. Gregory, & R. Sanjek (Eds.), Race (pp. 1-17). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Short, T. (1988). A "new racism" on campus? Commentary, 86(2), 46-50.

Smith, E. (1992). A comparative study of occupational stress in African American and White university faculty. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellon Press.

Smith, E., & Sneed, S. (1989). Inside the academy: Faculty attitudes about affirmative action. CUPA Journal, 40(3), 8-17.

Smith, E., & Witt, S. L. (1990). Black faculty and affirmative action at predominantly White institutions. Western Journal of Black Studies, 14(1), 9-16.

Staples, R. (1984). Racial ideology and intellectual racism: Blacks in academia. The Black Scholar, 15(2), 2-17.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). Qualitative analysis for social scientists. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sutherland, M. E. (1990). Black faculty in White academia: The fit is an uneasy one. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 14(1), 17-23.

Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development..

Tang, J., & Smith, E. (1996). Introduction. In J. Tang, & E. Smith (Eds.), Women and minorities in American professions (pp. 1-18). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly White institutions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

Whitt, E. J. (1991). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. The Review of Higher Education, 14(2), 177-197.

Woods, P. (1992). Symbolic interactionism: Theory and Method. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), The handbook of qualitative research in education (pp. 337-404). Durham, NC: Academic Press, Inc.